UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,771	01/22/2002	Bruce Loring Brown JR.	03399P074	6248

26529 7590 06/11/2007

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN/PDC
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER	
LIN, KENNY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/054,771	BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 May 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *43,46-49,51-60,63,64,67-70,72-81,84 and 85* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *43,46-49,51-60, 63-64, 67-70,72-81,84 and 85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 43, 46-49, 51-60, 63-64, 67-70, 72-81 and 84-85 are presented for examination. Claims 1-42, 44-45, 50, 61-62, 65-66, 71 and 82-83 are canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/17/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 43, 46-49, 51-60, 63-64, 67-70, 72-81 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al (Reed), US 6,004,205, in view of Brunson et al (Brunson), US 6,018,762, and Frietas et al (Frietas), US 2002/0049858.

5. Reed, Brunson and Frietas were cited in the previous office action.

6. As per claim 43, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for operating an electronic mail server system having databases associated with client devices (col.20, lines 65-67, col.21, lines 1-5), the method comprising:

a. Receiving input to change an organizational structure of a database (col.5, lines 5-17, col.29, lines 36-38, col.43, lines 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17);

b. Making a change to the organizational structure of the database in response to the input (col.5, lines 5-19, col.29, lines 36-38, col.43, lines 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17); and

c. Pushing a message to a client device associated with the database, the message comprising information about the change to the database, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the database stored locally in the client device with the database prior to notifying a user of the change to the database (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43, col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.12, lines 16-17, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

7. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of

the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

8. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

9. As per claim 52, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for operating a client device, the method comprising:

a. Receiving a pushed message (col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.37, lines 33-36);
b. Determining whether the message is a mail notification (col.36, lines 42-49, 51-53, col.37, lines 36-40); and
c. If the message is a mail notification, then decoding the message to obtain message access protocol parameters; connecting to a mail server and synchronizing a cached database stored locally in the client device with an associated database

stored in the mail server, wherein the synchronizing comprises using the message access protocol parameters to determine a change made to an organization structure performed prior to notifying a user of the change; and notifying the user of the client device of the change (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43, col.12, lines 16-17, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

10. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

11. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

12. As per claim 57, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for operating a client device, the method comprising:

a. Receiving a pushed message (col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.37, lines 33-36);

b. Determining whether the message is a mail notification (col.36, lines 42-49, 51-53, col.37, lines 36-40); and

c. If the message is a mail notification, then decoding the message to determine a change made to the organizational structure of a database stored in a mail server; and synchronizing a cached version of the database stored locally in the client device with the database prior to notifying a user of the change, wherein synchronizing comprises updating the cached database in response to decoding (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43, col.12, lines 16-17, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.42, lines 18-29, col.43, lines 1-15).

13. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the

mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

14. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

15. As per claim 64, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a electronic mail server system having a database associated with a client device, the system comprising:

a. A receiving mechanism to receive input to change an organizational structure of a database (col.5, lines 5-17, col.29, lines 36-38, col.43, lines 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17); and

b. A transmitting mechanism to push a message to a client device associated with the database, the message comprising information about the change to the

organizational structure of the database, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the database stored locally in the client device with the database prior to notifying a user of the change to the organizational structure of the database (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43, col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.12, lines 16-17, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15, 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17).

16. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

17. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

18. As per claim 73, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a client device comprising:

a. A receiving mechanism to receive a pushed message (col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.37, lines 33-36);

b. A processing mechanism to determine whether the message is a mail notification (col.36, lines 42-49, 51-53, col.37, lines 36-40);

c. A decoding mechanism to decode the message if the message is a mail notification thereby to obtain message access protocol parameters (col.12, lines 16-17, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-38, col.37, lines 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.42, lines 18-29, col.43, lines 1-15);

d. A connection mechanism to connect to a mail server and synchronize a cached database stored locally in the client device with an associated database stored in the mail server, wherein synchronizing comprises using the message access protocol parameters to determine a change made to an organizational structure of the associated database, wherein the connecting and synchronizing are performed prior to notifying a user of the changes (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43,

col.12, lines 16-17, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15); and

e. A notification mechanism to notify the user of the client device of the changes (col.8, lines 38-43, col.12, lines 16-17, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

19. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

20. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless

client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

21. As per claim 78, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a client device comprising:

a. A receiving mechanism to receive a pushed message (col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.37, lines 33-36);

b. A processing mechanism to determine whether the message is a mail notification (col.36, lines 42-49, 51-53, col.37, lines 36-40);

c. A decoding mechanism to decode the message if the message is a mail notification thereby to obtain a change made to the organizational structure of a database stored in a mail server (col.12, lines 16-17, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-38, col.37, lines 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.42, lines 18-29, col.43, lines 1-15); and

d. A synchronization mechanism to synchronize a cached version of the database stored locally in the client device with the database prior to notifying a user of the change, wherein synchronizing comprises updating the cached database in response to decoding (col.8, lines 38-43, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, 34-42, col.37, lines 2-6, col.39, lines 10-45, col.42, lines 18-29, col.43, lines 1-15).

22. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless and that the databases are mailboxes. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a

mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

23. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices. Frietas taught that client devices can be wireless (pp. 0003, 0006-0007, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Frietas because Frietas' teaching of using wireless client devices allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users (pp. 0023).

24. As per claim 46, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 43. Reed further taught that the change in the organizational structure of the mailbox comprises a change to a mail folder structure of the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

25. As per claim 47, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 46. Reed further taught that the change to the mail folder structure of the mailbox comprises at least one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

26. As per claim 48, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 46. Reed further taught that the information comprises parameters required by a message access protocol, to be used by the wireless client device to synchronize by retrieving the change to the mail folder form the server (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 21).

27. As per claim 49, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 43. Reed further taught that further comprising checking whether the wireless client device is subscribed to receive the message; and sending the message only if the wireless client device is so subscribed (col.5, lines 2-7, col.9, lines 8-16).

28. As per claim 53, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 52. Reed further taught that synchronizing further comprises retrieving new mail from the mail server, and updating the cached mailbox in response (col.20, lines 54-64).

29. As per claim 54, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 52. Reed further taught that synchronizing further comprises retrieving a change to a

mail folder structure of the associated mailbox from the mail server, and updating the cached mailbox in response to the change (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 21).

30. As per claim 58, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 57. Reed further taught to further comprising: notifying the user of wireless client device of the change to the mailbox (col.8, lines 38-43, col.12, lines 16-17, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

31. As per claim 59, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 57. Reed further taught that the change to the organizational structure comprises a change to a mail folder structure of the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

32. As per claim 60, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 59. Reed further taught that updating the cached mailbox comprises at least one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the cached mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

33. As per claim 67, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 64. Reed further taught that the change in the organizational structure of the mailbox comprises a change to a mail folder structure of the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

34. As per claim 68, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 67. Reed further taught that the change to the mail folder structure of the mailbox comprises at least one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

35. As per claim 69, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 67. Reed further taught that the information comprises parameters required by a message access protocol, to be used by the wireless client device to synchronize by retrieving the change to the mail folder form the server (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 21).

36. As per claim 70, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 64. Reed further taught to comprise a checking mechanism to check if the wireless client device is subscribed to receive the message, the transmitting mechanism then operating to push the message only if the wireless client device is so subscribed (col.5, lines 2-7, col.9, lines 8-16).

37. As per claim 74, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 73. Reed further taught that synchronizing further comprises retrieving new mail from the mail server, and updating the cached mailbox in response (col.10, lines 29-34, col.21, lines 1-5, col.31, lines 45-50, col.32, lines 23-28).

38. As per claim 75, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 73. Reed further taught that synchronizing further comprises retrieving a change to a mail folder structure of the associated mailbox form the mail server, and updating the cached mailbox in response to the change (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

39. As per claim 79, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 78. Reed further taught that a notification mechanism to notifying the user of the wireless client device of the change to the mailbox (col.8, lines 38-43, col.12, lines 16-17, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

40. As per claim 80, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 78. Reed further taught that the change to the organized structure comprises a change to the mail folder structure of the mailbox (col.20, lines 54-64, col.21, lines 34-42, col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

41. As per claim 81, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 80. Reed further taught that updating the cached mailbox comprises at least one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the cached version of the mailbox (col.23, lines 39-49, col.29, lines 29-34, col.42, lines 18-29).

42. As per claims 55 and 76, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 52 and 73. Frietas further taught that the message access protocol comprises the IMAP (pp. 0038, 0084).

43. As per claims 51, 56, 63, 72, 77 and 84, Reed, Brunson and Frietas taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 43, 52, 57, 64, 73 and 78. Frietas further taught that the message is sent using a SMS (pp. 0022).

44. Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al (Reed), US 6,004,205, in view of Brunson et al (Brunson), US 6,018,762, and Sherman et al (Sherman), US 6,505,214.

45. As per claim 85, Reed taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for operating an electronic mail server system having databases associated with client devices (col.20, lines 65-67, col.21, lines 1-5), the method comprising:

a. Receiving input to change a folder structure of a database (col.5, lines 5-17, col.13, lines 28-46, col.17, lines 52-63, col.18, lines 1-6, col.29, lines 36-38, col.43, lines 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17);
b. Making a change to the folder structure of the database in response to the input (col.5, lines 5-19, col.13, lines 28-46, col.17, lines 52-63, col.18, lines 1-6, col.29, lines 36-38, col.43, lines 29-40, 44-47, col.44, lines 14-17); and

c. Pushing a message to a client device associated with the database, the message comprising information about the folder structure change to the database, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the database stored locally in the client device with the database prior to notifying a user of the change to the database (col.5, lines 6-19, col.8, lines 38-43, col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.12, lines 16-17, col.13, lines 28-46, col.17, lines 52-63, col.18, lines 1-6, col.20, lines 51-64, col.21, lines 1-5, col.29, lines 36-38, col.37, lines 2-6, 36-40, col.39, lines 10-45, col.43, lines 1-15).

46. Reed did not specifically teach that the client device is wireless, that the databases are mailboxes, and the folder structure change to the mailbox comprises at lest one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the mailbox. Brunson taught to receive input to make changes to an organizational structure of a mailbox (col.5, lines 64-67, col.6, lines 1-20); and pushing a status message to a client device associated with the mailbox, the status message comprising information about the change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the client device with the mailbox (col.3, lines 29-35, col.6, lines 9-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed and Brunson because Brunson's teaching of synchronizing mailboxes including synchronizing the change of states of emails enables Reed's method to synchronize mailboxes when a change in state of any mail is detected (see Brunson, col.3, lines 29-35).

47. Reed and Brunson did not specifically teach that the client devices are wireless client devices and the folder structure change to the mailbox comprises at lest one of adding, removing, and renaming a folder in the mailbox. Sherman taught a database synchronization method that includes synchronizing created, removed and renamed folders in the database (col.8, lines 52-67, col.9, lines 1-9, 16-27) and that the client devices are wireless client devices (col.4, lines 20-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Reed, Brunson and Sherman because Sherman' teaching of using wireless client devices and synchronizing folders and subfolder allows Reed and Brunson's system to provide portable capabilities to users and synchronized databases to reflect deleted or created folders.

Response to Arguments

48. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

49. In the remark, applicant argued: (1) Reed does not teach or suggestion receiving input to change an organizational structure of a mailbox. Organization structure of a database refers to names and attributes of the tables of the database and relationship among the tables, not the entries stored in the table. (2) Reed does not teach or suggest pushing a message to a wireless client device associated with the mailbox, the message comprising information about the organizational change to the mailbox, wherein the information is used by the wireless client device to synchronize a cached version of the mailbox stored locally in the wireless client device

with the mailbox prior to notifying a user of the change to the mailbox. (3) Reed, Brunson and Frietas do not teach receiving a pushed message, decoding the message to obtain message access protocol parameters.

50. Examiner traverse the argument that:

As to point (1) and (2), in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., organization structure of a database refers to names and attributes of the tables of the database and the relationship among the tables) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Reed taught to receive changes of the content of a database (col.5, lines 5-17). Changing contents of a database automatically changes the structure of the database. For example: receiving new content to database automatically trigger the database to change structure; removing content from database also trigger the database to change structure. Since receiving changes of the content of a database automatically change the structure of the database, Reed automatically teaches to receiving input (e.g. content) to change an organizational structure of a database. Thus, the references in combination teach all the claimed limitation.

As to point (3), Reed taught to a consumer computer 2 to receive a information pushed from a provider computer 1 (col.9, lines 8-16, 44-47, col.37, lines 33-36). This clearly reads on the limitation of receiving a pushed message. Reed further taught to decode the notification message to obtain message access protocol parameters and synchronize databases using the message

access protocol parameters to determine a change made to an organization structure (col.36, 29-53, col.37, lines 36-67, col.38, lines 1-20).

Conclusion

51. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl
June 6, 2007